

**REMARKS**

The applicants have carefully considered the official action mailed on June 7, 2007, and the reference cited therein. By way of this response, claims 1, 8, 15, and 18 have been amended and claim 12 has been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-11 and 13-19 remain pending in this application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejections**

Claims 1-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Sizer, II et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,021,324) in view of Snelling et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,058,104). Claim 2 has been rejected as unpatentable over Sizer II et al. in view of Snelling et al. and further in view of Storek et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,434,395). Claims 3-5 and 8-17 have been further rejected as unpatentable over Sizer II et al. in view of Snelling et al. and Launey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,086,385). Additionally, claims 1 and 3-17 have been further rejected as unpatentable over Launey et al. in view of Snelling et al.

In the rejections of independent claim 1, the examiner asserts that Sizer II et al. and Launey et al. each describe all subject matter claimed, except for a wireless local loop transceiver to establish a wireless local loop point to point link to a geographically separate, non-mobile base station coupled to the PSTN. *See*, pages 3 and 6. However, neither Sizer II et al. nor Launey et al. describe a home security controller to communicate with a wireless local loop transceiver and with a home automation controller, as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

“To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” M.P.E.P. 2143.03. Sizer II et al. fail to describe any type of security controller or how such a security controller may be implemented in the system described by Sizer II et al. While Launey et al. describe a home automation system, no home security controller is described. Rather, the home automation system described by Launey et al. interfaces with the features of an external security system. Further, Snelling et al. do not describe a security controller in communication with a home automation controller or with a wireless local loop transceiver. Thus, the obviousness rejections of claims 1 and all claims dependent thereon must be withdrawn and these claims are in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 8 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 12, which has been cancelled. Specifically, claim 8 now recites requesting a user to speak an access code, performing a speech recognition on the access code, and determining whether the access code is recognized and belongs to a set of approved access codes. Claim 8 further recites performing a speaker verification of the user to allow access to the home automation and security features. In the official action, the examiner asserts that Launey et al. teach a speaker verification module. However, none of the cited art describes the multi-level, voice-based method of granting access recited in claim 8. Rather, the systems and modules described in the cited art are directed to providing a user with the option to give or receive voice commands to and from a device to manipulate the functions of a system that has already been accessed. Accordingly, the obviousness rejection of claim 8 must be withdrawn and this claim and all claims dependent thereon are in condition for allowance.

Regarding independent claim 15, none of Sizer II et al., Snelling et al. or Launey et al. describe monitoring a parameter or sending a message containing an electronic address over a

wireless local loop to a processor when the parameter exceeds a defined range. Thus, the obvious rejection of claim 15 must be withdrawn and this claim and all claims dependent thereon are in condition for allowance.

For the reasons stated above in relation to claim 1, none of the cited art describes a home security controller, as recited in independent claim 18. Thus, the obviousness rejection of independent claim 18 must be withdrawn and this claim is in condition for allowance.

While the official action rejects independent claim 19 as unpatentable over Sizer II et al. in view of Snelling et al., the applicants are uncertain as to which portions or sections of either reference describes the elements of claim 19. Neither Sizer II et al. nor Snelling et al. teaches or suggests several of the claim limitations. Specifically, the cited art does not describe performing a speaker verification of the user; when the user is verified, allowing the user access to the home automation and security features; receiving a voiced instruction to setup a home security controller in a warning mode; monitoring a forceful entry signal; when the forceful entry signal exceeds a defined range, sending a message containing a police telephone number to a processor; establishing a communication link to the police telephone number over a wireless local loop; or transmitting the message to the police telephone number. In fact, the official action does not include any indication or reference to the limitations recited in claim 19, aside from the blanket statement that “Sizer II et al. disclose all subject matter.” *See*, page 3. Thus, the obviousness rejection of independent claim 19 must be withdrawn and this claim is in condition for allowance.

**Conclusion**

For at least the foregoing reasons, the applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. If there are any remaining issues in this application, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the number listed below. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee due for the filing of this paper to deposit account number 50-2455.

Respectfully submitted,

Hanley, Flight & Zimmerman  
150 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 2100  
Chicago, Illinois 60606

/Daniel J. Glitto/

Daniel J. Glitto  
Registration No. 58,996  
Attorney for the Applicants  
(312) 580-1069

Dated: July 27, 2007